

KEVIN V. RYAN (CABN 118321)
United States Attorney

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CABN 138549)
Chief, Criminal Division

DEREK R. OWENS (CABN 230237)
Special Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, 11th Floor
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-6488
Fax: (415) 436-7234
Email: Derek.Owens@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
MATT TEITELBAUM,)
)
Defendant.)

CR No.: 06-00175 MAG

STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME

On September 13, 2006, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status conference. At that time, the parties stipulated that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from September 13, 2006, through September 28, 2006, for continuity of counsel and for effective preparation of defense counsel. The parties represented that granting the continuance was the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of new defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the

defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

SO STIPULATED:

KEVIN V. RYAN
United States Attorney

DATED: 09/14/06

/s/ Derek R. Owens
DEREK R. OWENS
Special Assistant United States Attorney

DATED: 09/28/06

/s/ Ron Tyler
RON TYLER
Federal Public Defender

As the Court found on September 13, 2006, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds that an exclusion of time from September 13, 2006, through September 28, 2006, is warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 18, 2006

